

2:00pm – Brendan Lyons – Albany Times Union CONFIRMED

## Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Follow up questions: There seems to be blame being cast at EPA, shifting guidelines, regulations.

JE: letter for federal dollars – letter for costs is reflects a lack of understanding of how Superfund works. Polluters pay the full costs. NY shouldn't be throwing in the towel at this stage of the game. Make sure that the polluter, not the taxpayer pick up all of the cost.

Has EPA already given money to NY? \$40 million – goes toward upgrading public water supply.

EPA had an existing health advisory number of 400. State of NY had test results showing 5 out of 6 drinking water samples was above 600ppt. Number at time was 400 ppt – short term. When Judith learned of exceedance – EPA had multiple conversations with state health department. Built in margin of safety. Ultimately EPA reduced the number to 70 ppt – 5 year review, peer review. Issue of 100 was that EPA knew Hoosick would be designing GAC and POETs and we knew it was going down and knew it was going to be no higher than 100. Final would be coming out. Very little confusion. Loyd Wilson from health department, when asked proudly talking about 50,000 ppt. EPA number was clear and was important. At the time, the health department wasn't confused, they just simply disagreed.

2:15pm – Andrea Cyr CBS affiliate CONFIRMED

## Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

JE: Way too early for them to throw in the towel and not collect costs from polluters.

R: confusing and conflicting.

Certainly no confusion when EPA first became involved. Federal advisory of 400ppt Hoosick was at over 600ppt. So EPA contacted the health department to raise concerns health department was not confused but disagreed. I think that's a good thing to have a safety margin built into these numbers. 5 year scientific review. Recommended 400 to 70. Shifting number downward provided even more protection. Today was the first that EPA heard about confusion. Over time, NYS joined EPA in our recommendation.

R: state can adopt stronger standards?

JE: yes, they can adopt their own standards.

Going forward an honest discussion about importance of protecting drinking water in NYS. We all need to pay attention to state and federal requirements and make sure that public health is protected. All agencies must work together and one of the most important roles of government is to ensure that you have clean drinking water.

EPA spoke out when important to do so. Everything we do was based on solid analysis.

EPA had existing 400ppt, then changed to 70 ppt. Before 70 was announced, EPA did advise that the number of 100ppt not be exceeded. Village was in the process of designing GAC we knew a revised number was coming out, we said until that number come out design to 100ppt. Fundamental problem is out first number was exceeded. No desire by health department.

Timeline?: JE: we don't know.

**2:30 pm – Rachel Yonkunas ABC 10 (ALSO FOX) CONFIRMED**

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Rachel: DOH was trying to say that 2015 – health effects not expected to occur, citing EPA “standard,” though they didn’t take higher levels into account.

JE: Advise that the DOH made not based on information from EPA, in fact we called DOH to ask if they had studies or data basing that on. We suggested that they remove that from fact sheet.

SRF – not appropriate for reimbursement. ERF helps upgrades for DW. In this instance we have known polluters who created contamination. Law (SF) allows for polluters to pay – state or federal. Too early for them to throw in the towel in collecting costs. Not call on federal taxpayers.

For many years, short term of 400ppt, but Hoosick came back exceeding 600ppt. After 5 years of scientific review and peer review. Long term of 70ppt in effect today. We knew process wrapping up didn’t want them designing to another number if we knew that the number was going down.

Not confused at all, simply disagreed.

2:45pm – **HOLD** for Mary Esch (reached out and have not heard back)

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

3:50-PM Asa Stackel NYT (NBC) CONFIRMED

## Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

**400ppt PFOA limit** – found wells above level – EPA guidelines not to tell people to stop drinking the water. Health advisory not a standard. But if you read the information – EPA short term guidance, C8 and other info – should be more than cautious. NYSDOH was not confused about that, they simply disagreed.

County Exec Gimino

Five or 6 samples were over 600 ppt. at the time our guidance was over 400ppt.

New number, knew that we were in the process of reducing

Superfund relies on the fact that polluters pay, not taxpayers. State should get polluters to pay and NOT federal taxpayers.

EPA has been very cautious and you always build in a margin of safety. Err on side of caution/protecting public health.

4:00pm – Scott Waldman Politico CONFIRMED

## Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

**Is it true that EPA guidelines has mislead state?**

JE: No there has NOT been confusion. There was early disagreement, but the state clearly understood our number of 2009 400pppt for short term exposure. Kind of a moot point, because Hoosick Falls consistently came in at over 600ppt in their water supply. They were not confused. They disagreed. They felt like our 400 number had a large margin of safety.

Is it an actual notion? Margin of safety

JE: always a margin of safety whenever you set a number. Appropriately you build that in. Once EPA Recommended that people stop cooking or drinking the water, DOH got to the same place. Health department honored that and followed that state-wide.

State shouldn't throw in the towel early and not seek costs from the polluter. Superfund law requires that polluters pay the cost, not federal taxpayers.

Relationship between State and EPA: EPA will continue to work with DOH and DEC on pollution problems will follow the law and follow the science. Public deserves to have clean drinking water and their health protected and we will continue to work with state agencies.

4:15 pm-- Jesse McKinley NY Times (Albany Bureau) CONFIRMED

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Reaction to the notion that EPA confused thing?

JE: No confusion between EPA and the DOH, there was disagreement. 4000ppt since 2009 – Hoosick Falls tested at over 600ppt. This lead EPA to advice people to stop drinking the water. DOH was not in agreement at the time, but came around. Weren't reading a webpage.

Jesse: Fall – results, hen EPA advised not to drink the water.

EPA first learned that people were drinking PFOA contaminated water October 2015. EPA made the case to inform residents. DOH disagreed, so EPA wrote to Mayor with Do No Drink suggestion. January 15<sup>th</sup>, we attended at meeting with public. Knew we were going through extensive process to review the number. We recommended 100, because we knew a new number was coming out. The NYSDOH distinguished people can follow the number.

We had extensive communication with them. They were not confused, we just disagreed.

4:30 pm Mary Esch – AP CONFIRMED

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Name bandied about?

Since 2009 EPA has had a short term health advisory for PFOA in drinking water. Late last year the EPA learn that the public water supply had levels in excess of 600ppt. Let to detailed discussions with DOH. The EPA decided to advise them not to drink the water or cool with it. This was in consultation with D.C. Not confused, they simply disagreed with the EPA. They said that the 400ppt had a built in margin of safety, and therefore they were not going to be guided. They were aware we were in the process of revising the number downward. A five year process including with a peer review panel. WE revised to 70ppt for long-term exposure. DOH was aware, and we were communicating every step of the way. Guidelines say action should be taken not that people shouldn't drink the water. JE: not about done, water work group with state and county and village and Saint Gobain meeting for a fairly long time, established in January in 2015. We became aware in October. Close to agreement, Saint Gobain would provide bottled water.

What about changing number and also EPA paying for the work?

Polluters should pay, not federal taxpayers. EPA had a very transparent process over a five year period. First number is short term, second number is long term. What did that cost the state more \$?

We were in consultation when they were designing the GAC and POETS and we knew the number would be not higher than 100ppt. So we recommended that they use the 100ppt.

4:45pm Michael Vilensky – WSJ CONFIRMED

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

5:00pm Timothy Cama, Staff writer, The Hill CONFIRMED

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Superfund is right vehicle to get the polluters to pay. We expect the polluter to pick up the cost, so the taxpayer. Don't throw in the towel so early.

Is there a federal role in holding polluters responsible? If it were to become a SF site, No confusion, there was disagreement. We have had a short term number since 1009 – 400ppt. Public water supply was testing at over 600ppt.

5:15 pm – Ed Damon – Bennington Banner CONFIRMED

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Not confusion, but disagreement. So-called fact sheet – theirs said based on evaluation, we don't expect health effects. Disagreement, but NO disagreement. DOH is professional agency in a large state, they can easily follow the change from 400ppt to 70ppt. Whether or not to say people shouldn't drink the water.

Polluters should pay, not tax payers. We will comply with the law and NOT spend tax dollars if there are parties that can pay the cost. NY may already be throwing in the towel to get polluters to pay.

5:45pm Kirsten Conley NY Post

## **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

Is state shifting blame?